The Perkins School *of* Theology
JOURNAL

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

SYMPOSIUM:

The Bible and Preaching

SERMON:

Who Do You Say I Am?

QUADRANGLE NEWS

ALUMNI NEWS

BOOK REVIEWS

WINTER NUMBER: 1954
Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas

THE PERKINS SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY JOURNAL

"Let us unite the two so long divided — knowledge and vital piety." — John Wesley

Volume VII WINTER NUMBER 1954 Number II

Southern Methodist University Press

CONTENTS

SYMPOSIUM: The Bible and Preaching 3
Introduction . . . . . *Fred D. Gealy* 3
The Old Testament . . . . . *William A. Irwin* 4
The New Testament . . . . . *Edward C. Hobbs* 8
Application . . . . . *Wesley C. Davis* 12
A SERMON: Who Do You Say That I Am? . . . . . *Bob Eastwood* 17
QUADRANGLE NEWS 19
ALUMNI NEWS 21
BOOK REVIEWS 25

Editor . . . . . *Howard Grimes*
Book Review Editor . . . . . *Fred D. Gealy*
Alumni News Editor . . . . . *James T. Carlyon*
Campus Activities . . . . . *William A. Irwin*
Editor, Student News . . . . . *Fenton Wicker, Jr.*

THE PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

William A. Irwin, Chairman; Earl Bowman Marlatt; and Thomas H. Marsh

The Perkins School of Theology Journal is edited for the alumni of the school and for the Methodist ministers of the South Central Jurisdiction. The Publications and Publicity Committee of the School of Theology is in charge of the project.

The Journal is published three times a year by the Perkins School of Theology, with the approval of The Board of Publications of Southern Methodist University.

SYMPOSIUM

The Bible and Preaching

I. INTRODUCTION

By FRED D. GEALY

ODDLY ENOUGH, during the nineteenth century and after, the Bible which should try men was itself on trial. With gathering force the accumulated ideas and interests let loose by the Renaissance and the Enlightment; the concomitant growth of nationalism, industrialism, and imperalism; the development of such all-absorbing philosophical systems as those of Auguste Comte, Hegel, and Herbert Spencer; the pursuit of the measured methods of empirical science with consequent exploration and manipulation of the visible world; and the new concern with the problem of history, rushed in upon the Church with flood fury. What now could it do with its hallowed Scriptures, which obviously were pre-European, pre-modern in origin, in form, and frequently in outlook? Could the Bible any longer be thought of as the revealed word of God? Integrated now into historical process, did it not share in all the frailities, fallibilities, and relativities which characterize all that is human? What sure word from God could the minister now speak?

Without doubt, in this situation the informed minister almost lost his Bible. He could no longer preach it with confidence or assurance in any traditional literal sense without fear of seeming ridiculous or offensive or even dishonest. Obsessed, as the last hundred years have been, by the fixed idea of history as stubborn fact, as what happened,[1] and by a sense of the importance for religion of the raw material of objective historic fact denuded of all possible interpretation, he could no longer with good conscience make further use of the old typological, allegorical, or "spiritual" methods of Biblical interpretation which had proven so useful to so many centuries in diverse religious traditions.

Sometimes, in this distressful situation, with a loud voice he would ring the changes on the old phrases and texts. But while vain repetitions and vague generalities fervently uttered might deceive some people, to the searching, the intensity of expression could not hide the hollowness of heart or the essential doubt ill-concealed by noise. Sometimes, the minister evaded the problem of preaching by becoming primarily a promoter-organizer-reformer on the one hand, or a sacramentalist-liturgist, on the other, in either case minimizing the importance of the sermon as prophetic proclamation of the Gospel as revealed in the Scriptures.

The end-result has been that as the Bible has become problem, not solution, there has been general abandonment of expository or Bible preaching, and some would say even the abandonment of the preaching of the Gospel. Preaching has commonly taken the form of "topical"

[1]Leopold von Ranke, 1795-1886, set the norm: "I decided to avoid everything fictitious and fanciful and to cling strictly to the facts." "History has had assigned to it the task of judging the past, of instructing the present for the benefit of the ages to come. The present study . . . only wants to show what actually occurred."

preaching, the topics considered being commonly determined by current interests or popular demand. For example, take the rash of sermons in our insecure time on how to be psychologically secure, integrated, happy. Such sermons may have Bible-texts attached to them as an afterthought, but the texts themselves are rarely formative in the sermon, nor are they developed or expounded in any significant way relative to the total Biblical revelation.

Even when the historical method of Bible study came to the minister himself as a welcome release and relief from long bothersome intellectual, ethical, and religious problems, it still remained a problem for preaching or for his essential function as herald of the Gospel. By and large the laity were and still are unaware of the changed approach and points of view which have forced themselves upon the schools, or know only enough to be frightened to antagonism. The minister, too, knows, that to whatever concerns source-criticism may be relevant, it is a wide-meshed net which easily lets the Gospel fall through, and that if we have nothing else to fish with we shall catch nothing.

Has the time come when we may expect a new era in Christian preaching, in which the new minister will have fully assimilated the procedures and disciplines of historical research, in which he can walk radiantly and confidently, surveying the entire sweep of the past, not as meaningless, unrelated events, but from the perspective of a significant and all-comprehending Christian faith? Can the new minister, made truly fruitful by the rich cross-fertilization of the historical method of Bible study and the fervid contemporary theological concern, again discover in his own encounter, the Word of God in the words of Scripture? Can the Bible again become the primary and essential medium of revelation in our time, and will the new minister become the bearer of this Word?

It is our belief that this time has now come. We further believe that it is the special responsibility of the theological school to produce this new ministry: to this end we are committed. Our concern has given rise to these four papers, written by four faculty members in the Biblical Division. It is our fervent hope that by outlining the situation, by analyzing the problems, we may be able to propose some lines of direction towards solutions and may encourage others, too, to take hold of this important work that we may all together move out into a new and more meaningful day.

What can be the meaning of the purchase of millions of copies of the Bible within two years, or of such multi-million dollar projects as *The Interpreter's Bible?* What can be the meaning of the great theological ferment and advance in our day? What can we say except:

> The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.

II. THE OLD TESTAMENT

By William A. Irwin

RELIGIOUS FAITH is of paramount importance both to the individual and to society. That its form and content enter intimately into the detail of common life is abundantly clear from the diverse cultures produced by dif-

ferent religions, and from the varying conduct manifest even among branches of Christianity. It demands, then, the best we can bring to it, certainly of surrender and devotion, but also of intellectual understanding and sound thinking. We may not exert out keenest thinking in secular affairs, convinced that only so can we attain our desired ends, and then put off our religious faith with shoddy methods and slovenly thought. God gave us minds as well as hearts.

Some such attitude as this has been the essence of the liberal movement in religion, which expressed itself notably in a great activity of Bible "criticism." Scholars felt that the Bible was of such importance that dependable knowledge about it was indispensable, as also a recognition of the point where fact terminates and alleged fact begins. All movements go to extremes; there is no denying that the critical movement at one time was excessively skeptical of tradition. But even with the re-examination compelled by an ensuing more cautious mood, the large outlines of the findings of that period in Old Testament study have stood the test of time and are today almost axiomatic: that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, which instead is composed of diverse sources, mostly subsequent to his time and some of them quite late; the tradition of the Davidic Psalter and the Solomonic origin of the wisdom books is true only in nucleus; the Book of Isaiah, just as practically every book of the Old Testament, is composite; most of them contain relatively late matter.

The mood and method have carried even further. Historians have evolved methods for sifting the dependability of documents and discovering from them the reality of the events they relate or mention. It is a procedure not unlike that of a court of law; the documents are introduced as witnesses and cross-examined as to whether they provide first-hand knowledge, or hearsay, or just plain imagination. Could we do other in the service of faith than employ a method that is vindicated by our best judicial procedure attested by the immense mass of dependable historical work?

But then perplexing results ensued; for it has become apparent that along with a large bulk of dependable records, the Old Testament has much that simply is not factually reliable. Does anyone want to hold, for example, that the earth is roofed over with a solid "firmament" through the eastern doors of which the sun enters each morning and scatters down a material substance, light, which it has loaded up in the divine storehouses somewhere outside our terrestrial bounds? The presence of errors is inescapable in the light of contradictions within the old Testament. To illustrate: Joshua, Chapter 11, in summarizing the successes of Joshua attributes to him a complete conquest of the land and annihilation of its inhabitants (except the Gibeonites); but Judges, chapter 1, has a catalogue of Israel's failures to do just this thing. 1 Samuel, chapter 17, tells the famous story of David's killing Goliath, but 2 Samuel 21:19 states that this same giant was killed by a quite different Bethlehemite.

Also, through use of historical methods, it becomes apparent that much narrative material contains no more than a vague nucleus of historical fact, and some was created by a late period as support for cherished doctrines. The matter becomes still more difficult when one realizes that certain religious beliefs endorsed by the writers can no longer comand assent. What about the cursing Psalms? And what of Jeremiah, Old Testament saint as he was beyond any question, whose bitterness toward his persecutors is far from the ideal that we should love our enemies and pray for those who wrong

us? Can anyone look upon Joshua's wholesale slaughter of the Canaanites — men, women, and children — in obedience to the command of God, with other than horror and loathing? It is only self deception to reason that they were bad people, hence Joshua's conduct was virtuous.

Such are some of the results of an open-minded study of the Old Testament. When one recalls that they have been constantly re-examined through many years, and that there is no reasonable escape from accepting them as in general correct, it becomes apparent that they pose a problem for the evaluation of the Old Testament, and for Christian thinking as a whole, which quite properly has always been Biblically based.

However, these are only *some* of the results. And when the rest are sketched a very different outcome is indicated.

It is just a little over a hundred years since Sir Henry Rawlinson published his decipherment and translation of the great "cuneiform" inscription on the rock of Behistun in western Iran, and opened to the modern world the literature and records of ancient near Asia. A little before, the young French scholar, Jean Francois Champollion, had accomplished similar elucidation of the hieroglyphic writings of ancient Egypt. The work of these two, although of remarkable genius and a high point in the romance of scholarly discovery, was still only a beginning. Hosts of scholars through the succeeding decades have taken up the task and pushed further and further our knowledge of the life and culture, the literature and the thought of all the ancient East.

For a hundred years, too, archaeology has been astonishing thoughtful people with its revelations, and its recovery of the actual cities and streets and houses where the men of Bible times lived and moved, as well as the very articles which they made or used. By comparison with the situation in Bible study in the middle of the nineteenth century, the result has been not less than revolutionary. The vast and thrilling panorama of the life of the ancient East, with all its pomp and pretense, its glory and its brutalities, and its common life of simple folk, has unrolled before us. The two millenia of high civilization in Babylonia and Egypt before Israel became a nation, the intricate course of travel and commerce and of armies through all nearer Asia and Egypt, the less obvious but more significant diffusion of culture and thought: all this has given us an unprecedented understanding of the world of the Old Testament, the conditions and background, and the intellectual culture and atmosphere in which Israel worked out her destiny and left to us some of the highest treasure of our historic heritage.

For an astonishing situation comes to view which could not have been fully realized in the centuries of our ignorance. Israel was a small and insignificant nation, a mere pawn in the great play of ancient power politics. Only for one brief period, in the time of David and Solomon, did it rise to political importance; for the rest, it was invaded, overrun, raided, carried captive, crushed seemingly into non-existence. In other areas of endeavor we find a comparable situation: the Hebrews had no art; their architecture was borrowed from the more famous culture centers; their science was accepted from foreigners; in literature and thought, too, they were in some way dependent on their neighbors. Yet all this falls into relative insignificance in the light of the further revelations of the new age of Bible study. For it has become clear that in two matters little Israel was unique and supreme above all the external might and display of the great empires of the ancient world. And these were its literary genius and its religious thought.

One understands Israel's literature not by disparaging that of her contemporaries, but by frank and honest appreciation of it. Great poetry and prose had been written for more than a thousand years before Israel was ever heard of. Yet humble writers, in primitive conditions, in the hills of Judah or the valleys of North Israel far surpassed the best that had been done. Far too few of those who study and love the Bible realize the skill of the Hebrew prose writers; unconsciously we pay it the tribute of reading it as modern literature — and rightly so, for it is a classic that stands out above the flow of time. Hebrew poetry is of indescribable beauty and power; its words, even in translation, sing themselves into one's consciousness. Yet the greatness of the Old Testament literature inheres most of all in its exalted thought. Men had for thousands of years wrestled with the basic questions of human being, the ultimate reality of the world and of man himself; great insights had been attained — the pagan religions were true, but of an imperfect truth. But all this was surpassed in Irsael's insights. Basing their thought in the best attainments of the world of the time, using freely everything of worth that they knew, but transcending and transforming it, the prophets and poets and thinkers of Israel advanced to concepts of such elevation and obvious truth that they have stood the test of the ages and have been the vital ferment in history, right into the confused issues of our own times. And those concepts, too briefly summarized, were that the supreme reality is a Person of goodness and holiness and love, in whom and through whose laws the life of man takes on meaning and exaltation. There had been nothing like this before; there has been nothing since to rival it. Our Christian revelation took it over in toto and built its own insights around it.

In such total meaning and significance of the Old Testament we have full answer to problems of the sort sketched above. We are not concerned about its standing as a book of science, not even about its historical accuracy. Even the religious inadequacies fall into unimportance in the light of the greatness of the vision to which the writers were moving on, and which they in such amazing degree attained. The reality of their divine inspiration stands out clear in the light of our modern knowledge. There was some strange thing at work in this little people, that set them apart from the great nations of the ancient world, and even from their near neighbors and relatives who might be supposed to have shared in their endowment. Nothing less than inspiration will suffice to explain it, though obviously it is an inspiration different from, and also greater and more meaningful than, the sort of thing that our former literalism postulated. The Bible is the word of God, His revelation to a needy and sin-sick world. One who understands this will realize too that it possesses to the full its ancient authority, an authority which again must not be interpreted in terms of pettifoggery; it is greater and richer and more powerful than a legalistic literalism; it is of the spirit.

This newer mood in Old Tetstament study has found expression in the movement of Biblical theology which is a marked feature of the present. We stand too close to it for the dispassionate appraisal that we can now undertake as to the critical activity of fifty years ago. A few comments, however, may be ventured.

The development is to be heartily welcomed; yet like all new movements it is already showing marks of excess. Its proponents uniformly pay lip service to the solid results of the critical period, and then — the most vociferous of them —

proceed in the mood of a century ago, as if criticism had never operated. Briefly, the Old Testament theologian too commonly falls before the temptation to pretty things, nice pious things, to "prophesy smooth things" without first asking rigorously what are the dependable bases of his work and what sound methods he must employ if his results are to merit respect as approximating truth. Nonetheless, the movement is essentially sound, and promises worthy results when its exponents have carefully examined what they are trying to do and how best they can go about it. For it is basically a reaffirmation of the continuing significance of the Old Testament: it is the word of God that speaks to our day as it has to every past age, and, we believe, will continue to speak through the unknown future.

III. THE NEW TESTAMENT

By EDWARD C. HOBBS

We are not, like so many, peddlers of God's word; but as men of sincerity, as commissioned by God, in the sight of God we speak in Christ.... We have renounced disgraceful, underhanded ways; we refuse to practice cunning or to tamper with God's word, but by the open statement of the truth we would commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.... For what we preach is not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, with ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake.... But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, to show that the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us.... Since we have the same spirit of faith as he had who wrote, "I believed, and so I spoke," we, too, believe, and so we speak.... From now on, therefore, we regard no one from a human point of view; even though we once regarded Christ from a human point of view, we regard Him thus no longer. Therefore, if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold, the new has come. All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to Himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.... We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God.
—Paul (II Corinthians 2-5)

A VERY SERIOUS dilemma appears to face any man who would preach the gospel today. On the one hand, the historical-critical movement of the last century, especially the past fifty years, seems to have left us a very tattered New Testament. We are constantly discovering that so-and-so didn't actually write the book that traditionally has borne his name; that Jesus very likely didn't utter such-and-such words attributed to him, at least not in the form we find them; that he probably didn't do this or that which is reported of him; and that even the four books which seem to offer us an account of him are often in disagreement over this or that point, often even on major matters.

On the other hand, we feel that our preaching should be Biblical, that it should center in this same Jesus Christ who seems to be fading away into the scholar's study. Unless we preach the Word of God, we have little to say. We would not be, like so many, peddlers of God's Word; yet, take away the New Testament from our preaching and we become mere soapbox orators, delivering a harangue on our own opinions, seeking to persuade others to our viewpoint. Moreover, there is a

crying need for a Word from the Lord; the man of our time goes to church asking, "Is there a Word from the Lord?"; he leaves with the clear impression that there is not.

This dilemma is so acute that a great many preachers shut their eyes to it, adopting a "solution" which simply disregards one or the other of the difficulties. Some accept the work of scholars, and are bereft of a gospel — the Bible becomes great literature, or so-so history, or the work of religious geniuses of various degrees, but the Lord does not speak. Others — perhaps more than follow the other course — ignore the work of scholarship, and pretend the Bible can be handled just as our forefathers handled it. The former alternative is in real disagreement with Paul: it does not preach Jesus Christ as Lord, but only our own (or our culture's) opinions; it regards everyone, especially Christ, from a human point of view; it has no ministry of reconciliation. The latter alternative is also at variance with the Apostle: it adopts disgraceful, underhanded ways (for it is not honest, being unwilling to face the Bible that actually is); it does not know that we have this treasure in earthen vessels, for it would get some of the transcendent power into our hands — by means of something or other that is infallible.

Is there any other path open to us?

First, it must be emphasized as strongly as possible that we cannot "get behind" the historical-critical movement or "go back" to some golden age of interpreting the Bible. We shall not make this horn of the dilemma less sharp by ignoring it. The real genius of the critical movement was not that it was "critical" in the sense of disparaging the Bible; rather, it was critical of our preconceived notions about it, and endeavored to correct these notions by means of an intensive and open-minded study of the Bible itself. It is easy enough to affirm the absolute agreement of the gospels with each other — provided we do not read them very carefully, or (better yet) read only one. But read them with care, and the curious fact emerges that they often do *not* harmonize in their telling of details or their general picture of this or that aspect of Jesus' ministry. When did Jesus cleanse the Temple — at the beginning or the end of his ministry? (Synoptics or John?) When did the cursed fig tree wither away — at once or in a day's time? (Matthew or Mark?) On how many animals did Jesus ride into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday? (Matthew or Mark?) And so on. We may not care which is "right"; but we cannot say that all are equally and simultaneously correct historical accounts — we must make some kind of decision. The fundamentalist makes a decision; he cannot avoid it. The scholar simply asks that we try to make our decision intelligently.

The critical movement gave us tools for asking and answering historical and literary questions; the tools were fashioned slowly, and improved again and again. To go back to a method prior to this movement is not to give up Biblical criticism; the question remains. The real issue is, shall we use tried and tested tools to seek solutions, or shall we resort to primitive ones? The commonest way to avoid the question is to avoid the relevant sections of the New Testament. We do not have to answer questions about just what words Jesus uttered in the "Sermon on the Mount" as long as we simply don't bother to read Luke. But read Luke as well as Matthew, and a problem exists. And to offer answers is to participate in the kind of Biblical study which we designate by the term "critical."

In sum, if we are to find any way out of the dilemma raised in the first paragraph, it must be by building squarely on the work of the last century, and going

forward. This is not done by giving lip service to it and then proceeding to talk as though it had not existed. It means we must take seriously the work of the best contemporary New Testament scholars, and endeavor to understand the implications of their work. It means we shall not berate such scholars as Dibelius and Bultmann for coming up with results differing from our preconceptions, but rather, we shall study the gospels anew with them in an attempt to understand what the early church really had to say. It also means that we shall not judge the merit of a scholar's work on the basis of whether it is "extreme" or tolerably "conservative." We may judge him on the basis of his method, and the skill with which he applies it; but the apparent "radical" or "conservative" character of his finding does not tell us whether or not his work has merit.

Let us not, therefore, have recourse to obscurantism, or pre-critical or uncritical methods, as a means of solving the problem.

There is another word to be said, however. Our real reason for studying the Bible, as Christian people, is not to learn more about ancient cultures or their methods of book-composition or the reliability of the gospel-writers as historians. An Orientalist as Orientalist studies the Bible for his specialized purposes, and the student of ancient poetry studies the Psalms for their literary merit. But the Christian *as Christian* reads and studies the Bible *because he expects to hear the Word of the Lord.* His primary concern is not for literature or history; the Bible has merit as a source for both of these, though it requires care in such use. But the Bible is not treasured in the church because of its aid in the advancement of learning. If the Bible does not in some way mediate to us the Word of God, then as Christian ministers and laymen we have no concern for the scholarly inquiries. They undoubtedly have interest, as do the latest researches of the biophysicist. But it is only as Word of God that the Bible becomes a life-and-death matter.

What is it that the New Testament presents as the preaching of the early Christian community? While any brief summary will be somewhat of a distortion, it might be put in some such way as this:

The long-awaited day of redemption has come upon us! God has mightily acted for the redemption and reconciliation of all men! This "act" or "event" centered in a person, Jesus Christ, so we may say we "preach Christ" — that is, we call upon men to respond in faith to the gracious redemption which God has wrought in Christ.

This is an astonishing declaration indeed. It claims a great deal; but there are many things it does not claim. The heart of the gospel of these early preachers was the declaration that *God had acted.* What would demonstrate such a claim? It is often suggested that this or that miracle, or all of them together, proved it. Is this the case? Suppose someone came around saying that John Jones had risen from the dead, and this was God's mighty work. We might look into an empty grave, and listen to witnesses tell of seeing him — and what would be our response? We would either clap the mortician in jail for neglecting to put the body in the casket, or else look for grave-robbers (assuming we did not accuse the men of deception); and we would classify their tales of "seeing" their friend with ghost stories of all sorts — we might or might not believe them, and we might suggest they report to the Psychical Research Society. *But* — we would surely not start a new religion! No astonishing occurrence proves that God has acted in such a way as to redeem men.

The redeemed community — the church — knew that God had acted for the reconciliation of sinful men with Himself be-

cause they were living in reconciliation with Him. They knew Jesus Christ to be the act of God which reconciled sinful men with Himself because in Christ they were living in reconciliation with Him — with the God and Father of their Lord, Jesus Christ.

In summary form, what this early community claimed was that God had acted decisively for man's redemption in Jesus Christ. This action they thought of as a single event, embracing the career of Jesus, his death, his resurrection, the coming of the Spirit, and the creation of the New Israel, the Redeemed and Redemptive Community. The act was not synonymous with any single part of the event; rather, the act was affirmed as the *meaning* of the *whole* event. The career of Jesus could easily be told — indeed, has often been told in recent times — in such a way that it is stirring, moving, tragic, exemplary, but not as the redemptive act of God. Similarly, the Exodus story can be told in such a way that it appears simply to be the escape of a band of slaves from Egypt at a time when things were going wrong for Egypt; and this would not necessarily be "untrue" to the "facts" — that is, nothing need be twisted or added to make it so appear. But the Hebrew told the story as the story of his salvation from bondage, and it was understood as an act of God's deliverance. The "facts," whatever they be, of Jesus' career simply do not show in and of themselves that God acted there for man's salvation. Rather, the latter is the *meaning* of his career and its attendant results.

This viewpoint, which I would maintain to be Biblical, certainly frees us from anxiety over the findings of the New Testament scholar. That God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself cannot be either proved or disproved by showing that Jesus did or did not utter a curse on a fig tree, or predict the details of the fall of Jerusalem, or anything else of the sort. No! Sinners who have found reconciliation with God through the living Lord Jesus Christ proclaim that reconciliation to others — to us; and when we respond to that proclamation by commitment of ourselves to that God and His gracious, forgiving, redeeming activity, then—and then only—we have a gospel to proclaim to others. *This* gospel is not founded on the latest researches of New Testament scholarship; it is founded on the only foundation there can be — our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

Is this a Word from the Lord? If it is not, then there is none at all; but if it is, then it is founded on faith in the gracious God whom Jesus called Father, and not on any arguments, any book, any creed, or any particular way of talking about it. This does not mean we reject books or creeds or arguments or frameworks of thought; it does mean that they fall into place as secondary to the event toward which they all merely point.

Seen in proper perspective, Biblical criticism is not a threat to the Christian gospel, but it is indeed a threat to many false gospels. Paul pronounces a curse on any — even an angel from heaven — who would preach a contrary gospel. We might not be so drastic, but we should clearly see that not everything which calls itself "gospel" is *this* gospel. Hence, any "gospel" which finds its support crumbling under the latest onslaught of the scholar might be advised that it was on a foundation of hay or stubble. The scholar does not — *can* not — investigate whether or not God actually was in Christ in reconciling the world; and this is the only foundation the Christian gospel has.

IV. APPLICATION

By Wesley C. Davis

BIBLICAL CRITICISM had a noble origin; it was born of the conviction that the Bible is of such immense importance that it deserves to, and must, be understood. Likewise, it has had a long and, on the whole, honorable history. Its foundations were laid in the first four centuries of the Christian era. Its aims have been clarified, its purposes sharpened, its methods improved, its instruments made more precise as it has shared in the general intellectual advance. Nevertheless it has always worked under the shadow of suspicion. "Shall God's word be subject to man's judgment?" has been and still is being asked. It was unfortunate that this discipline came to be referred to as a "critical" movement, for the very word carried with it the false connotation of "destruction," and thus obscured the idea of "evaluation," which is its real meaning. If occasionally criticism engages in the work of destruction it is in order to lay firmer foundations for understanding. Biblical criticism is a method, a means to an end; and no one knows its limitations better than the critic himself.

But the question remains: Is it true that Biblical criticism pauperizes the preacher by taking away things of value from the book which is the very fountain of his faith and the ultimate source of his preaching? The preceding papers have abundantly shown how rich has been the contribution of this type of study to the understanding of the Bible. It remains for this paper to show, by illustration, how it *enriches* the preacher's message.

How does Biblical criticism enrich the preacher's message? To put significant material in his hands which he thought had already been taken away is certainly one type of enrichment. A good example — perhaps the best example — of such material is the miracle stories. To our scientific age the idea of miracle is unpalatable, and the presence of miracles in the Bible makes the book itself a problem to many people. And yet, in the face of all this, we are now saying that this all-but-surrendered material is rescued by Biblical criticism, given its proper value, and placed at the disposal of the preacher. This is exactly what we propose to show.

It is possible to approach this task from either one of two ways. One might proceed in inductive fashion, for example, and show that critical study has given richer meaning to a particular miraculous event, then demonstrate in the same way that the whole concept of miracle has been enhanced, and finally that the entire Bible itself has been invested with a new and deeper significance. Or one might take the deductive approach and show that the Bible scholar has not only given us a new conception of the Bible, but has discovered new meaning in certain dubious stories like the miracles, and even in particularly difficult miracles. Because certain truths about the Bible as a whole are needed in elucidating the spiritual value of miracle, it is proposed to employ here the second of these methods.

Biblical criticism has given us a new and grander conception of the Bible. It is no longer conceived as a static book of rules given to or imposed on man. The Bible is a growth, rooted in the common stuff of human life. It is an excerpt from the life of a people who have a continuous history and who stand in a peculiar relationship to God. It is a record of the experiences of these people which they interpreted as encounters with God. In these encounters God spoke to them, dealing with them in

judgment and mercy. The Biblical writings, which grew out of the life of the people, were gathered together and handed on to the continuing church as "the revelation of God in history." These writings not only recalled the people's past with its deep meaningfulness; they also served to inspire and guide them in their day-to-day living.

The solidarity of the people of God is a constant theme throughout the Bible; this being so it is not difficult to see how that which gives meaning to the people as a whole was felt also to give meaning to their individual lives. Quite naturally the writers in recording these experiences were dependent on the language and thought-forms of their time. Quite naturally also they added their interpretation as they recorded the experiences, so that the resultant story is compounded of "fact" plus interpretation, inextricably linked. Later readers would not know where fact left off and interpretation began; nor would they care, for the interpretation, which tells of man's response in this encounter with the divine, was as valuable as the fact itself.

In this "new" conception of the Bible several conclusions stand out: (1) The essential message of the Bible is its total message; it is these 66 books, *taken together*, which are set forth as the revelation of God in history. (2) The Bible is an expression of the life of the "divine community," and therefore can be fully understood only by those who belong to the community. (3) The idea of "movement" is one of the main keys to the understanding of the Bible: God is leading, and man cannot be static. In giving us this new concept of the Bible has Biblical criticism taken away anything? Has it not rather given us a finer, more satisfying conception of God, man, and revelation?

But granted that historical study has given us a grander conception of the Bible as a whole, does it not contain certain ideas which stand in such sharp conflict with the best historical, philosophical, and scientific thinking of our time as to make them positively unacceptable? What about miracles, for instance? They simply do not happen today. No incident, therefore, no matter how loaded with spiritual significance, can be finally true or helpful when based upon, or connected with, miracle.

Our age in particular has little use for miracle. Even the minister shies away from it, not knowing what to do with it. When he preaches on it he has the unhappy feeling that he is not convincing, largely because he himself is not convinced. When he does use it he has to be highly selective, and extremely careful about the conclusions he draws. Rarely does the minister proclaim today, except in the most guarded way, that since the Biblical miracles were wrought by faith, a like faith would bring about similar miracles in our time; for he knows that even if he could persuade a person that this is true and prevail upon him to make the venture, the last state of that man would be worse than the first if the promised miracle failed to come. Current preaching on miracle therefore takes this tragic and dangerous form; it calls on people to believe in the miracles of the past, but it does not expect, nor greatly desire, that they be repeated in the present. This is tragic; it severs the thread of continuity; it sets the religion of the past over against the religion of the present.

Thus, in a very real sense, the miracles have been taken away. But was it Biblical criticism that took them away? Was it not rather the scientific spirit? In this situation Biblical criticism plays a saving role. It rescues the miracles and restores to them a *religious* significance which perhaps they have not had since early Christian times, certainly not since the advent of science.

This does not mean that the critics are deaf to what the scientists are saying. What

the critics are saying is that the men who wrote the Bible ought to be allowed to answer the questions that were being put to them, not the questions we are putting to ourselves. Miracle was an accepted concept during Biblical times. It is difficult to see how the writers could have expressed themselves, or have made themselves intelligible to their day, had they not used this idea. It was part of their world-view; and one's world-view is always the frame which holds the total picture of his thinking. Remove miracle from the Bible and little is left. But how did the Biblical writers use miracle? Miracles were given an eschatological interpretation; they were the signs of the presence or imminence of the kingdom of God. They spoke of God's providential care, his immediate presence in the world. They testified to their faith in the renewal of life, to their conviction that super-human power is all around us and is always available for us. As Grant says: "The real test of miracle with religious value was, then as now, and as in every age, whether or not it supplied proof of the presence, the power, or the purpose of God." When miracle is thus conceived it can't be given up; it is an essential part of the Christian message.

The task becomes more difficult when we consider particular miraculous happenings, such, for instance, as those which not only are in direct conflict with everything that life has taught us about the physical world, but also which have in themselves seem to have no religious value. Such a story is recorded in Mark 6:45 ff. According to this account Jesus comes to his disciples, walking on the sea. For him the law of gravity did not exist. The remainder of the story (v 49 ff), as indeed the preceding portion (45 - 48a), carries a religious message; but since it all clusters around an untenable and meaningless miracle, does not the whole story fall together? If the purpose of Biblical criticism is destructive, as is often claimed, this story would be one of the first to go. Let us approach it by asking certain questions about it.

Let us ask, in the first place, how, in all probability, preachers used this story before the rise of Biblical criticism? This miraculous event must always have presented a problem; for long before the physicists worked out the laws it was known that things heavier than water sink. The story was no doubt taken as a separate incident and allegorized, taken literally, or interpreted in harmony with the doctrine of the church, according to the preacher's taste and the occasion's demand. From what we know of the general religious outlook of that period it is not inconceivable that the story may have been used to show Jesus' superiority to the physical forces, and it is quite possible that this superiority may have been explained on the grounds of his divinity. But if so, this would be attributing to Jesus something which he himself denied. A tenable interpretation of the second temptation (Mt. 4:5 ff) is that Jesus is here meeting and effectively resisting a suggestion that he show his superiority to what we call natural law. Even if Jesus did walk on the water, as the present story indicates, it is difficult to see how the miracle in and of itself could have had any religious value for the people of that time. It certainly has none for us.

Let us ask, in the second place, how the preacher, caught in the unresolved dilemma of our day, uses the story. The dilemma, as we have seen, is very real. The minister today lives in a scientific age, and he is not unaffected by it. In all probability he grew up believing that the Bible is the sure, unchanging word of God. He cannot have escaped hearing something about Biblical criticism. If he has been to a seminary he has been exposed to courses in it; if not, he has probably read about it. Now let us suppose that many of the preachers of our

day know something about science though they are not scientists, and something about Biblical criticism though they are not committed to it — surely a reasonable supposition. How do such preachers deal with the story before us? The possibilities here are many. If one's mind tilts toward rationalism he dismisses the story at once, and without apology; it couldn't have happened. If he wants to do justice both to the pull of his head and the pull of his heart he translates the phrase "by the sea" (which the Greek permits) rather than "on the sea," and so avoids the problem. If he be one of those who has no deep conviction about anything, who desires to become all things to all men and thinks he can serve two masters, he will "give them what they want." On occasion he will show that from the standpoint of science the story is absurd; on other occasions he will preach the whole story as if it were capable of application in its totality today. More often perhaps he remains silent about the whole thing, on the theory that it is better not to disturb the people. But any way we look at it the miracle has already been lost; and in the last instance the preacher along with it.

Finally, let us ask how the preacher who is trained in and committed to the discipline of historical study uses this story. He begins by asking certain questions about the story itself, though the questions are not all of equal importance. Did the miracle really happen? That seems to be the basic question for any historical approach. The event either happened or it didn't; and the answer to the question determines further procedure. But, strange as it may appear, to this particular type of preacher that question is of minor significance. Whether or not it happened can be determined only by the weight of evidence, and by the time this story was written down *bona fide* evidence would not be available. Whatever germinal act lay at the center of the story would be obscured as the story took shape under the various influences operative in the early church. But the story — and the miracle, which is a part of the story, or the "frame" which holds the story — would be of immense value to the church, whether the things recorded happened this way or not; for it was an integral part of the total "event" of which the Bible is the written record. It would have little if any significance if lifted out and given separate interpretation; for it belongs to the church, is the record of an experience of the church, and could be understood by and have significance for the church alone.

But the next question, why the church remembered the story and wrote it down is very important. We have no way of knowing what happened to start the story; but whatever happened, it spoke to these early Christians of Jesus; and as they clothed the fact with interpretation, and so made a unitary story whose significance lay in its totality, they were testifying to Jesus' sensitiveness to his disciples' distress, his concern and constant care, his available help in every time of need, his ability to come in unsuspected ways. And the final question, why the church treasured the story and gave it a place in the canon is answered in the same way. The early church had little peace; it was beset by enemies on every hand; it stood in constant peril. What could be so heartening to the continuing church — rarely free from struggle — as to read the story of God's help given to his people in other times of need, and thus to fortify their hearts with the assurance of his abiding presence? If this interpretation is valid, Biblical criticism has not only not destroyed this miracle story; it has rescued it from loss. And if the Christian preacher can put it to such helpful use, he stands indebted to the historical critic.

We end where we began. It is our con-

viction that the historical study of the Bible or Biblical criticism, when rightly understood and employed, can make the "Bible again become the primary and essential medium of revelation in our time," the veritable word of God. From this no one will profit more than the preacher.

V. SUGGESTED READINGS

The following books are listed *in the order* in which they should be read for greatest profit. The viewpoint of Bultmann, for instance, will not be comprehensible without some sort of preparation such as the other books provide.

John Knox, *Criticism and Faith.* Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952. $2.75.
Treats the problem of the "threat" of Biblical scholarship to the foundations of our faith; concludes with an excellent treatment of the relation of historical criticism to preaching, with examples. Unless this problem is decisively settled in your mind, it is futile to read further in contemporary Biblical studies.

Robert M. Grant, *The Bible in the Church.* Macmillan, 1948. $2.50.
A brief, interesting, and informed account of twenty centuries of Biblical interpretation, beginning with Jesus and Paul, running through the centuries, and including an account of modern Protestant interpretation, with a final chapter on the meaning of interpretation.

John Knox, *On the Meaning of Christ.* Scribner's, 1947. $2.75.
The third of a series of three books on Christ (the earlier two: *The Man Jesus Christ* and *Christ the Lord*), but it may well be read alone. This one deals with the problem: How important is Jesus Christ for us, and what is the nature and ground of that importance? Many of the usual tangled questions about Jesus' historical career and the validity of the gospel records concerning details will be put in a new (and helpful) light by this book.

C. H. Dodd, *The Bible Today.* Macmillan, 1947. $2.50.
A clear, well-written presentation of "The Bible Today" — a brief summary of interpretation of the Bible through the centuries, the general outlines of contemporary historical criticism, leading up to the urgent questions about history: history as revelation, the historical problem of our time and the Bible, and the relation of historical revelation to the individual.

Chester M. McCown, *The Search for the Real Jesus.* Scribner's (Out-of-print).
A brief yet comprehensive survey of the "life-of-Jesus" research since D. F. Strauss, 1835, with special recognition of and concern for the determining significance of varying philosophies of history on interpretation and reconstruction of the life and teachings of Jesus.

Martin Dibelius, *Jesus.* Westminster, 1949. $2.50.
One of the very few really good, up-to-date books on Jesus. Not a "life of Jesus" in the usual sense, but as near one as should be written. This is an opportunity to come face to face with Jesus of Nazareth, as far as that is possible, through the help of modern New Testament scholarship.

Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament,* Vol. I. Scribner's, 1951. $3.50.
One of the greatest German New Testament scholars of our time here presents the framework of thought and the witness to the gospel within that framework, of the various New Testament writers and personages. The material is given chronologically, beginning with Jesus, and concludes with a lengthy study of Paul (one of the best anywhere). Vol. II will cover John and after, but has not yet been translated. Do not start this book until the preceding books have been digested.

A SERMON

Who Do You Say That I Am?

By BOB D. EASTWOOD

The following sermon was preached in the basic Homiletics class at Perkins this fall. Bob Eastwood is a middler from Oklahoma City.

"WHO DO you say that I am?" This question demands an answer which is the most crucial answer that can be given by a person who *says* he is a Christian. And, if I am a Christian, then my honest answer must be, "You are the Christ."

When Jesus asks this question, He does not want the opinion of a third person. He does not want to know, "Who do *men* say that I am?" For it does not make any difference to my life if *another* says he is a prophet or he is the Christ. The question that involves my life — not just my intellect — is who *I* say He is. No one can make my decision for me. It does not matter today if I remember that once in years past I stood before a group and a preacher and said with my lips, "For me Jesus is the Christ." What Jesus asks *now* and will never stop asking of *you* is, "Who do *you* say that I am?" Do you see now that this is the crucial question?

It is not my purpose at all to persuade you to answer to this crucial question, "You are the Christ." But rather I shall assume that each of you has said before and will affirm now that for you, Jesus *is* the Christ. I shall grant that you honestly believe that Jesus is Christ for you. I shall assume that you are all Christians. What we shall consider is this: What are the implications of this answer? What does it mean to answer, "You are the Christ"?

When we speak of Jesus as the Christ, we mean that He is nothing less than God in man. He is not a being apart from God. He is not a separate diety. Rather Christ is a presentation of God to us.

For us, then, Christ is the supreme revelation of God. What we really say when we answer, "You are the Christ," is this: "For me, God is the greatest value. God *only* gives ultimate or final meaning to life. Our highest loyalty is to God and the guide to this loyalty is the Christ of the *New Testament.*" If I answer, "You are the Christ," then I am faced with the necessity of making all decisions and facing all situations with Christ as my guide and supreme value. He is the basis for my response to any and all events of my life.

In my opinion, this is what we have to mean if Christ is Christ for us.

Now, let's take a look at *my* values. I'm talking about *you* and myself. What is the meaning of life for you? Rather I mean, what is the meaning of life for me?

One answers, "I am seeking peace of mind, a calmer, serene, comfortable life." This is his value. He asks Jesus to provide means for comfort. Jesus is not God but a means for this man to gain his own ends.

Another answers, "A man is supposed to be happy and not long-faced, isn't he? A person has to try to be happy." Happiness is his value. His prayers are for confidence and insight to see the well-balanced life.

Strength to stand against confusion in his desire. Why? Happiness is his value. Jesus is the means.

What do we all say about democracy? Of course a man is entitled to freedom. A man has a right to be free. Some will fight for it. It is their value. They never ask, "Freedom for what?" Their end is freedom. This is their value.

Who has said, "I don't want to hurt my parents; I can not disagree with them"? Then I live a life that carefully avoids bringing pain to my parents. My parents are my meaning for the way I live. My value or basis for action is what my parents will think. Yet, we don't really love our families until they cease to be an idol and become children of God who err as we do.

Here is the one that hits me and hurts. I squirm when I think of it. "I live for the Church and its service." The Church gives meaning to my life and governs my actions and thoughts. Then the Church is my value and not God.

God bless the unselfish man who lives not for himself but for the welfare of his family. He gives himself up to the governing of his children and the happiness of his wife. God bless him especially, I pray, because his family becomes his meaning and highest value. For him God is not *his* God.

These are all our idols. These things give meaning to our lives. We don't need Christ except as a source of energy to help us in our worship of idols. He is the means to our ends. He is not God really. We have not really said, "You are my Christ."

What can we do when we see this, but cry? Do you see that we fervently seek idols? Do you see that I become the meaning of my own life? Where is my trust? In these idols. Where is my meaning for life? In these idols. What is the "Good" for me? These idols. We can't turn our backs. We want to be honest in answering our questions. We worship idols.

I am the preacher. I have invited you in and have beaten you over the head until — MY HEAD HURTS. Perhaps I am not talking to you. Perhaps these are not your problems and your gods. Perhaps I talk only to myself. I came here armed to knock out your props of false goods. But as I swing at you I find myself falling to the floor.

Suppose, then, I *really* say for me, "You are the Christ." What happens if God as revealed through Christ becomes the chief value of my life? What are the results? Will I be happy? Can I do enough to earn a place with God after I die? If you ask these questions, you are still concerned with "I" and not with the praise of God. This is still selfish.

Do not misunderstand me on this point. We may still love our families. We may still serve through the Church. But these things we do in response to God. We say, "God loves me." Then we express our love to God by service to our associates. We may still *do* the same things — although probably not quite the same. But the difference is in our motives. No longer are these things ends, but rather a means of expressing our love to God. I can't even point to God for you and say, "There He is." I cannot show you what response to make. All I can do is to help you see some of our obstacles in finding the true God. I have torn down and put nothing in its place. But I cannot face your decision for you. Your values depend upon how you answer the crucial question that will press you for your entire life. It is, "Who do YOU say that I am?" This will determine your response to what happens in your life. I cannot make the response for you because I am not you. I can only respond in my situation to God for myself.

But how do we know that God is our first value? I do not know how you will

(Continued on page 20)

QUADRANGLE NEWS

In Memoriam

Mrs. A. W. Martin, Wife of Professor A. W. Martin
Professor of Church Administration and Director of Field Work

---

Bishop Paul B. Kern
Dean, 1920-26

Mrs. John W. Elliott, Wife of John W. Elliott
Middler Student, Perkins School of Theology

STUDENT NEWS

Edited by Fenton Wicker, Jr.

ONE OF the most significant projects carried on outside the regular channels of Seminary administration is the work done by the wives of students. This work is done through and under the sponsorship of the Wives' Circle of the Woman's Society of Christian Service, affiliated with Highland Park Methodist Church. Begun by Mrs. A. W. Martin some five or six years ago, this group continues to be an active and significant part of the Seminary Community. Some sixty of the wives belong to the circle this year. Among other projects, the group contributes $20 per month for the support of two Korean war orphans. Officers of the circle include Mrs. James W. Waggener, President; Mrs. Lee Reiff, Vice-President; Mrs. Allen Baumgartner, Secretary; and Mrs. Robert Baird, Treasurer.

The study group under the sponsorship of the Circle has enrolled almost ninety young women this fall. The lectures, on the Old Testament, have been presented by Professor Irwin, and the ones for spring will be given by Professor Davis. A three-year program covering the major areas of the Seminary curriculum has been projected, with various professors from the school being asked to share their knowledge with the group. Mrs. William A. Holmes is the student wife in charge of this enterprise.

Perkins students were hosts to the Texas Methodist Student Movement for its annual Thanksgiving conference. The theme this year was "Christ's Way — Our Answer." Speakers were Dr. Mack Stokes of Candler School of Theology and Dr. H. D. Bollinger of the Department of College and University Religious Life of the Board of Education. A Perkins student, Marshall

Hodge, was retiring president, and Richard Deats, a junior student, was elected president this fall.

The Junior class honored the memory of Mrs. A. W. Martin recently in a gift to Bethlehem Center of Fort Worth. Money was contributed to buy furnishings for the new prayer chapel in the Center.

The student council sponsored the second Book Exchange this fall. This is a student-centered effort to allow used books to be purchased and sold at prices below regular used book levels. Seventy-five students were reached by the sale, of which Jim Hardison and Hugh Hardin were co-chairmen.

Five Perkins students attended the Southwest Regional Interseminary Conference at Enid, Oklahoma, November 5 and 6. One of the speakers was Professor Gealy, who spoke on "The New Testament Conception of the Ministry." Richard Yeagley, a senior student, is Southwest Regional representative for the national movement.

The Perkins Forum Committee has sponsored two discussions during the fall, the first of which was on "Freedom in a Democratic Society" and the second on "Negro Opportunities in Dallas." Prominent citizens of Dallas spoke during the forums.

The faculty wives are sponsoring a student-faculty coffee hour once a month in Perkins Lounge during the year. This is a most anxiously anticipated two hours for many students. If you want to attack *formgeschicte,* you choose one corner; if you want to defend your branch of existentialism, there is another; and if you just want to mingle, the main purpose of the social hour is for that. This coffee time is most thoroughly enjoyed.

Intramural sports brought a crown to the quadrangle in the form of a Smith Dormitory championship. They became the Independent football champions of the campus in a 39-0 slaughter of the Engineers. The basketball team is now busily protecting its crown of last year. They have won all games thus far.

The marriage of Jimilene Laman, who has been dietician at Perkins Cafeteria since the opening of the quadrangle, took place on December 20. Miss Laman will be greatly missed by those who have come to know her during the three and one-half years she has been here.

Class elections for the year resulted in the following class presidents: Senior Class, Byron Hasstedt; Middler Class, Sale Lilly; and Junior Class, Richard Deats.

WHO DO YOU SAY THAT I AM?

(Continued from page 19)

know. But Martin Luther said, "I would go to hell for the glory of God."

What is your answer to this test? If I knew that I were going to hell, if there were no doubt that I should be punished and tortured and put away from any contact with God when I die, would I still praise God and love him in this life? If God is God for us we must reply, "Though he slay me, yet will we follow him."

Do you remember when Jesus called his disciples together and asked, "Who do *men* say that I am?" And then do you remember that he asked, "But who do *you* say that I am?"

It could be that Jesus was asking: "What really and honestly are your values? What is your meaning for life?"

May I ask you one final question for your consideration and thought? It is a question that Jesus first asked some time ago. I suggest to you that he is asking you now, "Who do YOU say that I am?"

ALUMNI NEWS

Alumni Luncheon

The annual Alumni Luncheon will be held on Wednesday, February 3, 1954, during Ministers' Week, at the Highland Park Methodist Church Activities Building. Tickets will be on sale beginning Monday night of Ministers' Week. The number attending will be limited to 350.

Dr. Lewis N. Stuckey, who has been chairman of the Perkins section of the Alumni Fund Council, will be the principal speaker. Dean Merrimon Cuninggim will make his annual report to the alumni, and the Seminary Singers will sing.

This event has come to be one of the most significant in the history of the school, and you are cordially invited to attend.

ALUMNI NOTES

J. T. CARLYON, *Editor*

Umphrey Lee (M.A.), President of the University, was president of the first senior class of S.M.U. and received his degree at the first commencement of the new university. He has been recently honored by the naming of the new union building, now under construction, "The Umphrey Lee Student Center." The Provost of the University, *Hemphill Hosford,* and the Vice-President, *Willis M. Tate,* are also alumni of the University.

Bishop A. Frank Smith, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, was the first of a goodly line of episcopal leaders who have studied at S.M.U., he having been here in 1916. He is now resident bishop of the Houston-San Antonio Area. He was followed by *H. Bascom Watts,* of the Nebraska Area, in 1917-1918; by *W. Angie Smith,* of the Oklahoma Area, in 1919-1920; by *William C. Martin,* the Dallas-Fort Worth Area, B.D., 1921; by *Paul E. Martin,* the Arkansas-Louisiana Area, in 1922-25; by *Eleazar Guerra,* the Mexico Area, in 1925-28; and by *Santa Barbieri,* Buenos Aires Area, B. D., 1932.

Among its presidents, the University has numbered *Bishop Hiram A. Boaz* and *Bishop Charles C. Selecman.* Among the deans of the School of Theology appear the names of Bishops *Edwin D. Mouzon, Hoyt M. Dobbs,* and *Paul B. Kern. Bishop John M. Moore* was at one time Chairman of the Board of Trustees. *Bishop Ivan Lee Holt* of the St. Louis Area for some years occupied the chair of Old Testament in the School of Theology.

Robert W. Goodloe (B.D., Yale, 1918) took his M.A. Degree in S.M.U. with the first class. He is joined in the present fac-

ulty by the following students or graduates of the University: *Gaston Foote,* Visiting Professor, 1953, 1924; *A. W. Martin,* 1925; *Lamar Cooper,* Arts and Science, 1939; *Howard Grimes,* 1940; and *J. B. Holt,* Visiting Professor, 1953-54, 1945.

1922

William H. Cole is completing seven years as executive director of the Board of Education of the Central Texas Conference. In addition to training school programs through the winter he is promoting recreational activities in several charges and planning the camps for next summer. His son, Dr. Richard Cole, was married December 27, 1953, to Miss Katie Hurst of Houston.

Joe I. Patterson of Mexia, Texas, is taking special interest in the education of his three sons. Jim White is doing graduate work at the University of Virginia; Joe is at the S.M.U. Law School; and Julian is a freshman in Arts and Sciences.

1925

A. W. Martin and family have been bereaved in the death of Mrs. Martin, October 28, 1953. Funeral services were held in Cox Memorial Chapel, Highland Park Church. Dr. Marshall Steel and Dean Merrimon Cuninggim in charge. Interment was at Pea Ridge, Arkansas. Some twenty fellow ministers of the North Arkansas Conference gathered about Dr. Martin for a short service, conducted by the Rev. Ethan Dodgen of Jonesboro.

1927

Hubert Sone, Principal of Trinity College, Singapore, reports an enrollment of 42 students, 26 of whom are Methodists. It is a union college, supported by Anglicans, Methodists, and Presbyterians. After thirty years in China, Mr. Sone was transferred to this position some years ago. He continues to be supported by the Highland Park Church in Dallas.

1930

William Rubal Moore completed two years as pastor of Tennison Memorial Methodist Church at Mt. Pleasant, Texas, on October 31, at which time he became Executive Secretary of the Board of Education of the Texas Conference. His family joined him at the end of November in Palestine, Texas.

Philip Walker at First Methodist, Denton, observed in November "Spiritual Revival and Commitment Week." The following eight ministers delivered messages: Erwin F. Bohmfalk, George C. Baker, H. C. Hoy, J. T. Carlyon, H. H. Hollowell, Alfred Freeman, Lewis Stuckey and J. B. Holt. The last three were fellow alumni of the School of Theology.

1931

Virgil Morris, who was compelled to wear a cast on a broken leg for some four months, writes cheerfully of his improvement and of the good health of the children. His many friends have grieved with him in the death of Mrs. Morris, caused by the automobile accident in Mexico during the summer of 1953. A suitable memorial to her has been placed in the New Orleans hospital where Virgil has been cared for. He has just led the New Orleans District in a successful Spiritual Life Mission.

1935

Alsie Carleton, pastor of University Park Church in Dallas, was asked to offer the prayer at the opening of the SMU-Arkansas football games on November 14. He is leading his church in a $300,000.00 financial campaign, which will both clear the debt on the sanctuary and add necessary new buildings.

1936

Wayne McCleskey, ardent S.M.U. Alumnus, is the pastor of the family of Kosse Johnson, football star of the 1953 Rice championship eleven. The McCleskey's

live in a lovely new stone parsonage at Baytown, Texas. The church people are looking forward to a new sanctuary in the near future.

1938

Monk Bryan, First Methodist, Maryville, Missouri, represents the Missouri Conference on the Board of Trustees of S. M. U.

Garland T. Lavender, pastor of Couts Memorial Church, Weatherford, Texas, announces that the old church property has been sold and a new structure is under way. Possession of the old building must be given within nine months. What a lovely parsonage is theirs!

William E. Trice, pastor of University Church, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, is quoted in the "Amen Corner" of the *Christian Advocate* for November 12. Mrs. Rawls of Eldorado, Arkansas, where he held an evangelistic week last year, sends this choice word from one of his sermons: "Character is secured on the installment plan, and each day we deposit part of it in the bank of God." It sounds a bit like Whitehead's doctrine of "the Consequent God."

1939

Ed McCleskey, who was greatly beloved when associate pastor of St. Paul's Church, Houston, has found his niche of usefulness as Counselor and Personnel Advisor in the Tennessee Gas Transmission Company of Houston. His wife Doris graduated from S.M.U. also, in 1940.

Gordon Birdwell, 1938-39, is host to the multitude of Methodist fishermen who flock to Aransas Pass "where they bite every day." He is living in a new parsonage, equipped with two baths and beautifully furnished.

Billy Bray and family have adopted a new daughter, whose name has been changed from Yukarie-chan to Margaret. With the two boys, Jimmy and Tommy, the family now seems complete. Their address is 10 Kwansei Gakuin, Nishinomiya, Japan. Why not drop them a post card for the New Year?

1940

Richard Irving, whose forte is public speaking, has recently been asked by the Board of Temperance to leave his pastorate in Denton to become field representative of the Board. He will speak throughout the United States in the interest of personal abstinence.

Kenneth Shamblin, pastor of Pulaski Heights Church in Little Rock, is serving a highly useful task of President of the Ministers' Association of his city.

1941

Robert E. Goodrich, Jr., pastor of First Church, Dallas, has added to his many other achievements a series of 13 television programs entitled "The Pastor," filmed in Dallas but sponsored by the National Council of Churches. At press time, the program had been accepted by 55 stations throughout the nation for regular telecasting.

1942

Cleburne W. Quaid, associate pastor of First Church, Shreveport, Louisiana, was listed among "the outstanding ministers" who put over a notable "spiritual revival" in historic First Church, which claims 5,300 members, sixth in size of all the Methodist churches in the U.S.A. The other Sunday evening preachers during this six weeks of evangelism were Kenneth W. Copeland, Paul V. Galloway, Bishop Paul E. Martin, Alfred H. Freeman, and Kenneth Pope. Five of the six were alumni or ex-students of S.M.U.

1944

Maurice Riseling began in September, 1951, a most satisfying experience as Minister of Counseling in the First Congregational Church of Los Angeles, California.

His home address is 766 33rd Street, Manhattan Beach, California.

Tom Shipp was the subject of a long and highly commendatory article in *Town North,* a monthly magazine for the Park Cities of Greater Dallas. From a handful of charter members in 1945 the congregation has grown to more than 2,000. One of the noon luncheon clubs recently voted him the Outstanding Young Man of Dallas for the year 1952. Tom keeps on his list of constituents over 400 alcoholics whom he seeks to shepherd. He is pastor of Lovers Lane Methodist Church.

1946

Ervin M. Gathings, at St. Mark's Church in Cleburne, Texas, is culminating a very popular ministry in that city by building a complete new sanctuary and educational building, in a new location at the edge of the city.

Larry M. Stokes and his people at First Methodist Church, Brookshire, Texas, were delighted with the opening of the new church buildings and the sermon by Bishop A. Frank Smith on November 22. The sanctuary is panelled with Philippine mahogany and the "center of worship is provided by a six foot brass cross, especially made for the church, with a background of dark maroon velour."

1948

Robert McMaster, with his wife and three children, left Lake Street Methodist Church, Blytheville, Arkansas, on December first. They have a three-year appointment to Ketchikan, Alaska, under the Board of Missions. Their third child is called Daniel Louis and was born September 26, 1953.

1949

Edwin Keith, until last year the associate pastor at First Methodist Church of Little Rock, Arkansas, has become the Director of Stewardship of his conference, with address at 723 Center Street, Little Rock. He is quoted in the *Advocate* "Amen Corner." "Prayer is exhaling the spirit of man and inhaling the Spirit of God."

Richard Smith, pastor of Ridglea Methodist Church, West Side, Fort Worth, Texas, began a building program a year ago. An educational unit was constructed at a cost of $43,000. This year the chapel has been remodelled and enlarged at a cost of another $10,000. He reports a quadrupling of his Church School and a doubling of church membership. Richard represented Southwestern University at the inauguration of the new president of the Southwestern Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, November 24, 1953.

William T. Stephenson, associate pastor of University Park Church in Dallas, was chapel speaker on November 17, 1953. He reports a vigorous cooperation with the Perkins School of Theology Field Work program. The three ministers of University Park have taken eight men from the Perkins student body to assist them for the school year. The church makes a generous contribution to the scholarship fund of the school.

1951

Dee Hinckley, who for the past two years has been associate pastor of Trinity Church in El Paso, Texas, has recently been moved to Wetumka, Oklahoma.

1952

Milton Dare, pastor of Wesley Methodist Church, Harlingen, Texas, is rejoicing over the green light given by the men of his church, looking toward an ambitious building program. Chapel, fellowship hall, kitchen, and children's rooms will make up the first unit.

Charles L. Fromer is chaplain (1st Lt.) of the 16th Armored Engineer Battalion, stationed at Fort Hood, Texas.

BOOK REVIEWS

Psychotherapy and the Christian Message

By Albert Outler. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954. 285 pp. $3.50. Publication Date: February 3, 1954.

There are at least three reasons why readers of the *Journal* will welcome the opportunity during Ministers' Week to secure pre-publication copies of this book by Albert Outler. First, he is one of us, having been appointed professor of theology at Perkins in 1951. Further, the Peyton Lecutres in 1953 included much of the material contained in the present volume. But beyond these personal reasons is a more fundamental one: this discussion fulfills an urgent need by providing a serious consideration of the terms on which the Christian Gospel, with its ancient roots, can be brought into relevancy with the modern movement of psychotherapy.

Dr. Outler's purpose, which he carries out with remarkable clarity and completeness, is to point out "how to relate psychotherapy and Christianity in valid synthesis and productive alliance." He himself sets two ways in which his study must be limited: by a choice between rival schools of psychology and by the statement of a particular formulation of Christian theology. He chooses as the most representative of the psychotherapeutic theories those which may be generally classified as "neo-Freudianism." His theological position, again stated generally, lies within the "classical" concept of theology, with more emphasis on reason and "natural" theology than many theologians today will allow.

Consideration is given to four basic aspects of the human person: the concept of the self and its freedom; the estimate of the human person; the expectation of his potentialities; and the nature of human conduct. In each area he shows how psychotherapy may be both ally and rival to the Christian Faith.

The basic point of view, which seems basically sound to me, is this: psychotherapy and Christianity are not rivals so long as psychotherapy does not affirm the naturalistic and humanistic assumptions of most of its proponents as the *only* faith in which its "practical wisdom" can be set. Further, Christianity need not fear the invasion of the human person by psychotherapy but rather welcome its aid — provided it does not insist on its particular faith. "Let Christians gratefully receive the best psychotherapy has to offer in clinical help and practical wisdom," he writes. "Let us learn what they can teach, about human motivation and behavior, about the disorders and repair of psychic life — and make responsible use of what we learn, in good conscience and with disciplined understanding. But the Christian must stand on Christian ground, and not be overly impressed by claims that the *faith* of psychotherapy has the same scientific authority as its clinical axioms."

Conversely, Dr. Outler says to the psychotherapist: Not only will the Christian faith not interfere with the practice of psychotherapy; actually its context is a much more adequate one than that in which psychotherapists ordinarily operate. Indeed the human self finds its true freedom, fulfillment, and health only when it recognizes and affirms not only its own *being* but also its *ground* of being — God as creator, Redeemer, and Consummator.

> It seems to me, therefore, that a Christian context of psychotherapy is more truly human and more fully humane than one which seeks to exhalt man as his own savior. The Christian message has a radical pessimism concerning man's unaided virtue and reason and yet, because of its unflinching realism about man as sinner, the Christian version of the human possibility is all the more glorious — and still as realistic. If man is no more than a complex natural entity; if he is his own judge and savior; if the world is indifferent to

his fate — then, man is quite beyond redemption in the Christian sense.

Although it is not the purpose of this review to evaluate the theological position inherent in the book, it should be pointed out that at least two aspects of Dr. Outler's theology make the alliance between psychotherapy and Christianity easier than it would be, let us say, in extreme Calvinism or Barthianism. Both of these have to do with his doctrine of man. The high estimate which he puts on man's *natural* capacity for reason makes him more receptive to the wisdom which comes from outside the Church than many theologians are, and hence leads him to the willingness to *use* the insights so obtained within the framework of the Christian faith. Further, in the insistence that man's state is perverted goodness rather than *original* depravity, he leaves the way open to a more serious view of the rather striking "cures" wrought by psychotherapy and to the working of God's grace in ways other than those accepted by traditional Christianity.

> After a century of rather fatuous liberal optimism about human goodness, followed by the recent quarter-century of disenchantment and downward revision of our estimates of human virtue, the time is past due for a Christian doctrine of man which holds in solid balance both classical motifs of original sin *and* original righteousness — to the end that we may honestly account for the virtues which psychotherapy discovers in the human maturation and also for the radical need for conversion, faith and grace which carry us far beyond the resources of human therapy.

To put it another way, at no time does Dr. Outler deny the necessity of the radical work of grace which faith in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ brings to us. On the other hand, he would insist that God works in many ways, and that the "natural man" is capable of responding, though inadequately, to the healing forces of His grace. On this ground, Christians can rejoice in the description which psychotherapists have made and the techniques they have evolved for the cure of souls; yet they must ever affirm the distinctiveness of God's grace as revealed in Christ.

Either psychotherapy may be rejected as false; it may be accepted uncritically; *or* — and this is an important alternative — it may be accepted in its practical insights and rejected in its metaphysical context. "As psychotherapists are willing to learn from the Christian evangel, many of them will discover that it is the power and wisdom of God for man's true health and salvation. And as Christians are willing to learn from the great and growing store of clinical truth in psychotherapy, they will find a fresh confirmation that God has many witnesses to His grace who do not know His Name — and yet these also He would bring into the community of His love."

To Dr. Outler's general thesis, I add a most hearty "Amen." Further, while not in complete agreement with his theological position, I am convinced that it provides a productive synthesis between the naive assumptions of liberalism and the despair of much continental theology. We can only hope for a more complete statement of his theology than the present book provides. In the meantime, to fail to read this essay is to miss a most stimulating analysis of one of the more significant dialogues taking place today between the Church and the world — that between psychotherapy and the Christian message.

HOWARD GRIMES

PSYCHOLOGY OF PASTORAL CARE

By Paul E. Johnson. New York, Nashville and Dallas: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953. 362 pp. $4.75.

For a long time there has been a need for such a volume at this. Dr. Johnson has produced a work which will prove useful both for the pastor-in-service, and for the pastor-in-training in his seminary classes in pastoral care and counseling. It serves a wider function than Hiltner's and Wise's recent books on pastoral counseling. It covers many of the same areas as the symposium edited by J. Richard Spann, *Pastoral Care,* though it discusses them more thoroughly

and has the advantage of a single author who is better grounded in psychological insights than many of the writers of that book. With a few reservations, the book is to be highly recommended.

Although Dr. Johnson's book is more theocentric than most such works, it still often falls into the error of putting the focus on *persons in themselves* to the exclusion of the meaning of that person's life in terms of his relationship to God. One may ask, Does this have significance for counseling? I would say that it does, and refer to Dr. Outler's essay reviewed above as a positive answer to this question. A person-centered ministry is essential — provided these persons are seen in their relationships both human and divine.

Actually Dr. Johnson is not unaware of this necessity, and in a final chapter he makes a conscious effort to state a theology. In doing so it seems to me that he elevates his theory of interpersonal relationships into a theology, and makes God in the image which his psychological theory seems to posit. Had he omitted the final chapter, the book would have been much more satisfactory to me. Dr. Johnson is a much better psychologist than a theologian. That would not preclude his making the emphasis suggested in the paragraph above, however.

Let me hasten to say, however, that this is a most useful book. The chapter on meeting death is far superior to anything else with which I am familiar. His discussion on "grief work" is not only psychologically sound but also practically helpful in the day-by-day parish work of the minister. Chapters on confession, marriage and family counseling, and the ministry of healing are almost equally useful. Although the book is not a technical work on counseling, other chapters serve either as an introduction to the field for anyone not already familiar with it, or as a review for the person who has done previous study in this important area of work.

The pastor who stops short of the final chapter will miss but little, but he who never begins the book at all will be a less adequate pastor for failing to do so.

HOWARD GRIMES

CHRISTIANITY, DIPLOMACY AND WAR

By Herbert Butterfield. New York, Nashville and Dallas: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953. 125 pp. $1.75.

The publisher's blurb says, "Here is a thoroughly informed, Christian evaluation of the roles of diplomacy and war in human life." And it is almost true.

Certainly the adjectives are justified, for the author, who is Professor of Modern History at Cambridge University, is an eminent historian whose writings reflect his profound understanding of Christianity as well as of the secular forces of history. But the scope of this essay is not so ambitious as the advertisement suggests. With marked modesty Butterfield attempts simply to give some perspective to the present international disorder. He discusses with poise, felicity, and an uncommon grasp of fundamental facts, the nature of the disaster we face, the chance of surmounting it, and the problem of war and diplomacy today from a Christian standpoint. Here are the materials for a Christian answer to the jingoism and self-righteousness of our time and place.

Butterfield's analysis centers in his conviction that this is "one of the occasions when, if a single party to the quarrel can discipline itself, the effect may make all the difference in the world." It is we, of course, who must practice the self-discipline, for Moscow is "making itself the centre of all mischief." This discipline will stem from Christian understanding of the sinfulness of all men, ourselves very much included, and of the doctrine of love, calling for us, at the least, "to make allowances for one another." "Christian charity is the grand and mighty exorcism," and we may employ it successfully at the present time not as the "righteous arrayed against the wicked," but as "confessed sinners" seeking to rescue those who have not yet owned its sway.

In the rude world of war and diplomacy how can this be done? Butterfield's mild, hard realism leaves no room for either pacifist or crusading tempers. He makes

two points with great force of reasoning. In the first place, we must abandon the hideous luxury of fighting the unlimited "war of righteousness;" and must substitute for it, when fighting becomes inescapable, the war "for limited purposes." "The implications of the 'war for righteousness' are that compromise becomes impossible, the original defensive object is superseded, the war becomes a war of unlimited ends, and — since there are only certain things that can be achieved by force — the root of the matter is: unlimited expropriation." All this breeds further, and more horrible, war, and the Christian must set his face against it. Horror, these days, is on our side, for Korea may presage the re-entry into Western thinking, after half a century of the opposite sort, of a war for limited purposes.

Secondly, we must eschew, in our effort to escape war of any sort, what Butterfield calls "ideological diplomacy" which will inevitably divide men into two irreconcilable groupings. Again calling for a spirit of Christian charity, we must replace it with that kind of diplomacy which never loses sight of an international order that includes all governments and all peoples. The U.N. can help, if we know what we are after, but it can also be used for the wrong kind of diplomacy: Butterfield points out the grave danger "when anti-Nazis become too like Nazis themselves, or anti-communists too like communists, in their angers and hatreds and indignations." Once again we must recover that concept of diplomacy which is based on "an attempt to examine warfare from a point of view that embraces both belligerents, envisages the international order as a whole, allows for the paradoxes in the story, and so curbs self-righteousness that maxims of a moderate and chastened kind are brought into existence."

What are our chances? Butterfield does not traffic in false hopes and predictions. But if you want a brief, solid discussion of "the relationship between the Christian faith and the pressing problems of our international situation," here is one of merit.

MERRIMON CUNINGGIM

CHRISTIAN REALISM AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS

By Reinhold Niebuhr. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1953. 203 pp. $3.00.

The book contains eleven essays, five of which have not previously appeared in print. The subjects are those which are dear to Niebuhr and which he treats with such penetration and power, such as "Faith and the Empirical Method in Modern Realism," "Why is Communism So Evil?" The Foreign Policy of American Conservatism and Liberalism," "Diplomacy, Secularism, and Christianity," "Augustine's Political Realism," "Love and Law in Protestantism and Catholicism," and "Coherence, Incoherence, and the Christian Faith."

Niebuhr does not need to be recommended; only to be read.

FRED D. GEALY

PHILOSOPHERS SPEAK OF GOD

By Charles Hartshorne and William L. Reese. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953. 535 pp. $7.50.

The authors of this big volume refer to themselves modestly as editors. They are that and more, since they have their own comments to make in every chapter after they have listed the pertinent passages from the philosophers of the centuries. It is a book of particular interest and value for preachers and theologians who would look at the story of civilized thinking from the point of view of the central concern of religion. The University Press has acted in harmony with the university's interest in Great Books. To read this well-edited book and to think with its critical authors is a liberal education.

Hartshorne and Reese announce at the very beginning that they are not writing an objective history of philosophy. They are the enthusiastic proponents of a system of thought, best illustrated in this country by the work of Alfred North Whitehead. They have been enamored of the Process conception of God, which seems to them to meet the needs of careful reasoning and of good living. Their system is given the name of *Panentheism*, a union of the two

words, *Pantheism* and *Theism*. The preface presents quotations from Oriental and Occidental philosophers who share in the general position to be sustained through the treatise: Mahanam Brata Brahmachari, A. N. Whitehead, Nicholas Berdyaev, Soren Kierkegaard, and G. T. Fechner.

Because of a misdirection of thought the human mind has insisted on simplicity rather than on complex reality. So we seek to make God over-simple and wholly monistic, as against the vote of life itself. They establish as a fundamental assumption the truth of the "Law of Polarity" as stated by Morris Cohen. "According to this law, ultimate contraries are correlatives, mutually interdependent, so that nothing real can be described by the wholly one-sided assertion of simplicity, being, actuality, and the like, each in a 'pure' form, devoid and independent of complexity, becoming, potentiality, and related contraries." Instead of this there must be found room within all serious thought of God both the actual and the non-relative. Philosophy has tended to be monopolar when it should always have a clear element of dipolarity. There must be two poles in our thought of God; there must be a tension as real as that between the two poles of our electrical world. "Thus a process must be inherent in God's nature whereby his infinity is acquiring realization" (Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, p. 357).

The doctrine of Panentheism can be stated in the following attributes of God: "Eternal — in some aspects of his reality devoid of change (birth, death) . . .; Temporal — in some aspects capable of change, at least in the form of increase of some kind; Conscious, self-aware; Knowing the world or universe, omniscient; World-inclusive, having all things as constituents."

Among the ancients the authors deal severely with Aristotle, whose system, they declare, "satisfied neither philosophical or religious demands." On the other hand, Plato is nearest to the position of the editors who would label him at least as Quasi-Panentheist. He did not resolve all the contradictions in the divine nature, but left them wherever life required and truth permitted.

Modern Panentheists include Schelling, Fechner, Peirce, Pfleiderer, Varisco, Whitehead, Berdyaev, Iqbal, Schweitzer, Buber, Radhakrishnan, Paul Weiss, and Alan Watts. Three other modern philosophers are listed as limited Panentheists; James, Ehrenfels, and Brightman.

The final paragraph of the book gives the full panentheist conception of God. "The superrelative or reflexively transcendent perfection of God is the fullness of his being, his wholeness as always self-identical, but self-identical as self-enriched, influenced but never fully determined by (and never fully determining) others — in short, a living, sensitive, free personality, preserving all actual events with impartial care and forever adding new events to his experience."

Here is another book to be added to the growing Whiteheadian literature of our time. Granted the position of this major British-American philosopher, the work seems to me quite outside of criticism. The authors do not argue for Process as the only true system. They desire only to show how well it has served the cause of high morality and noble spirituality, even as it has met the demands of reason.

J. T. Carlyon

Agape and Eros

By Anders Nygren. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953. 764 pp. $7.00.

Westminster Press has again made available Bishop Nygren's classic study of Christian love. The work was originally published in three volumes, 1932-39. It is now brought together, in part retranslated, and conveniently published in one volume.

Nygren's thesis is well-known, but may be briefly summarized. Rather baldly put it is that Eros, Nomos, and Agape are the fundamental motifs of Hellenism, Judaism, and Christianity. In spite of important differences between Hellenism and Judaism, both are fundamentally egocentric: in Hellenism, Eros does not seek God for His own sake, but as the *summum bonum*, i.e., it seeks God for the satisfaction of itself, of its own highest good which it happens to identify with God. In Judaism, Nomos regards fellowship with God as something to

be achieved in virtue of man's fulfilment of the Law, it is a theology of Merit.

It is only in Christianity that the theocentric way of salvation is fully seen: the love of man for God means a whole-hearted surrender to God, desiring only that His will should be done. Agape in God is entirely independent of external stimulus and motivation. God loves because it is His nature to love. It is neither kindled by attractiveness nor quenched by the unattractiveness of its object. God always retains the initiative in love. If man cannot show this kind of love towards God — his love always being response — he can towards man. This is the importance of the love-your-enemies test.

Whatever criticisms may be made of Nygren's analyses and categorizations, the work has been very fruitful. It is hoped that the new printing will move the church to new adventures in understanding and practicing Christian love.

FRED D. GEALY

THE BIBLICAL FAITH AND CHRISTIAN FREEDOM

By Edwin Lewis. Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1953. 224 pp. $3.50.

Here is a series of major sermons, on the Pauline text, "For freedom did Christ set us free." It is a clear call to trust the Biblical revelation, but at the same time to read the Scriptures with open minds and with free spirits. The chapters are essentially the lectures given at Georgetown, Texas, as The Southwestern Lectures of 1952. It must have been a feast of great preaching for those who were privileged to listen as the messages were delivered.

I can well imagine Texas preachers going back to their churches to share with their people such sentences as the following. "God's word about himself is also God's word about mankind." "The Bible is the most important possession of the Christian Church." "Biblical preaching is Biblical knowledge set on fire." "The principle of faith is — *faith!* And the first child of faith is — freedom." "God made himself known to a few that he might make himself known to all." "Faith is not a chain, but a wing. It does not bind; it sets free." "The ways of God are passing strange at times, but they must still be reasonable."

While Dr. Lewis calls us back to the Bible, he insists on a genuine freedom, and not on the old authoritarian Biblicism of yesterday. The Word of God must not be confused with the words of men which accompany it. Therefore, the critical study of the books of the Bible is essential. God discloses himself to men; but at that point man's reasoning faculty must enter into theology.

The final chapter is opportune, as Dr. Lewis pleads for genuine ecumenicity, oneness in the will of God and in devotion to the Kingdom of God. It is the Church, the Body of Christ, and not the forms of religion that can make the one, universal Church.

J. T. CARLYON

GOOD AND EVIL; TWO INTERPRETATIONS

By Martin Buber. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. 143 pp. $2.75.

This little book is really two, as the subtitle indicates, and as Dr. Buber tells specifically in his preface. It comprises two independent series of lectures which, related in theme, are properly united in a single publication. The first essay through a study of Psalms 12, 14, 82, 73, and 1, deals with right and wrong as questions of individual experience. In the second, entitled "Images of Good and Evil," the problem is of the origin of evil; it is pursued through the medium of Hebrew and Iranian myths. The whole is informed with that depth and insight which have made all Dr. Buber's works matters of high concern. Possibly for many readers his handling of mythology will be a mild revelation, for he has treated it seriously as the important vehicle of truth which it really is. One may feel some uneasiness about some aspects of his exegesis of the selected psalms; perhaps also toward his interpretations of them and the myths. But all alike express that deep religious sincerity for which Dr. Buber is well known.

WILLIAM A. IRWIN

Secular Illusion or Christian Realism?

By D. R. Davies. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. 111 pp. $2.00.

A sad little book which is a proper sequel to the author's earlier tribute to an American theologian, *Reinhold Niebuhr, Prophet from America.* He has been deeply impressed by the pessimism of the Gifford Lectures on *The Nature and Destiny of Man.* He shares with Niebuhr the thesis that there is no genuine moral progress in this world, even with the aid of the Church. The victory of God and of righteousness must be looked for "beyond history." Progress is an illusion. "It is probably true to say that the lot of the ancient slave was no worse than that of the de-classed modern worker . . . A similar analysis of prostitution, child exposure, and other ancient evils would reveal a similar conclusion." "Humanity is a diseased race." Of the Renaissance and the Reformation together he has this to say, "In these world-shaking movements humanity struck its tents and went on the march. In them, human pride . . . broke loose and began its career of gigantic inflation . . . The Reformation . . . was a European disaster."

The one bright promise for our world lies in the Church. "The Church is not the Kingdom itself. Her contradictions and violations of Christ's will are too glaring. But, in spite of all her infidelities to Christ, she is the shell within which the Kingdom, the new humanity, is taking shape in history for a destiny and fulfilment beyond history."

Dr. Davies spent the earlier years of his ministry in the Congregational Church, but more recently has become vicar (Anglican) of Holy Trinity in Brighton, England.

J. T. Carlyon

Luther Now

By Hanns Lilje. Philadelphia: Muhlenburg Press, 1952. 190 pp. $2.25.

A good handbook for those who have seen or will see the film on Martin Luther. The author is a bishop in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Hanover, who has suffered in the service of the church which bears the name of Luther. He is also a member of the executive committee of the Evangelical Church of Germany in which three church groups have been affiliated: Lutheran, Reformed and Prussian Union. So he writes as one committed. He helps us see Luther and his movement as a German Lutheran knows them. "We know little of the 'anguish of existence' or the feeling that the 'age of the church' is over, because we have never known a state church."

Bishop Lilje, who believes that Luther is the most significant figure in the Christian Church in the past four hundred years, cannot understand why he is so little known. "With the exception of John Wesley and Thomas Carlyle, the Anglo-Saxon world has never paid much attention to him." Our author believes that this age is in special need of the guidance and the inspiration of the great Reformer.

This book takes greater interest in the political and the social conditions of the world into which Martin Luther came than most of us have done. It comes with a bit of shock to many of us to read that "History engaged in a rather fantastic plot when it placed three superior rulers simultaneously as chief actors upon the stage of Europe." Surely I had not guaged Henry VIII of England, Charles V of Hapsburg, and Francis I of France in any such terms.

But back of all other forces were the movements of the Spirit of God. "A new epoch in history began because of one man's struggle for God . . . Luther surrendered wholly to God and in this act found not only God the judge, but God the giver, not only the God of wrath, but the God of grace . . . Beautiful, like a spiritual springtime are Luther's teachings during the first quiet years after the agony had come to an end."

J. T. Carlyon

New Testament Literature

By T. Henshaw. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1952. 446 pp. $6.00.

This book was not written for "specialist theological students"; rather its aim is to acquaint those who have had little if any theological training "with the light which modern scholarship throws on the literature of the New Testament." The author has

a thorough acquaintance with the field, and presents his material in an interesting manner.

Sections I and II, dealing with introductory matters, and section IX, which contains a number of indices, constitute important parts of the book. Chapter one gives a good presentation of the world of the New Testament. A clear treatment of the process of canonization, together with a brief consideration of the several writings which came near but failed of inclusion is found in chapter two. The next two chapters — Section II — deal with the pre-literary period, the shaping of the gospel story, the nature of early preaching, as well as with some of the earliest written sources. Among the indices in Section IX are brief but helpful statements concerning the important extra-canonical writers and writings.

The body of the book — Sections III-VIII — is taken up with the critical questions relating to the 27 books, as well as with other important matters, such as the historical value of the several writings. Since Mr. Henshaw is merely seeking to give interested readers a resume of critical New Testament scholarship as it stands today, he is content to present the variant views on disputed matters and, after weighing them, to give his own opinion. "On disputed points the view of the majority of experts has not always been taken; in some cases the matter has been left open, and in a few a minority view has been accepted."

We may mention a few of his views which are somewhat individualistic: (1) He holds that the collection of Paul's letters was done not by some prominent Christian or group of Christians who may have borrowed them from the archives of local churches or from private persons: "It is more likely that Paul kept copies, at least of his most important letters, and that on his death they passed into the custody of the church, and were in due course published, perhaps at Rome, in order to satisfy a widespread demand for them." (2) Romans, according to his view, is really an apology for Christianity, though this fact is concealed by the pattern of alternating "kerygma" and "didache." (3) Several of the writings which are generally held to be late are given a much earlier dating; for instance, Hebrews was written before 70, and the Pastorals in the last decade of the first century. (4) He refers to a theory, evidently with approval, that Paul may have had a copy of Hebrews before him when he wrote Colossians.

WESLEY C. DAVIS

How to Study the Psalms

Based on an Exposition of Twelve Favorite Psalms. By Robert T. Daniel. Westwood, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell, 1953. 271 pp. $3.00.

The twelve Psalms are 1, 8, 15, 19, 23, 32, 40, 46, 51, 90, 91, and 103; they merit well the adjective "favorite," though doubtless most readers will regret the omission of many others. But who can limit the treasures of the Psalter to twelve poems?

After a brief introduction to the forms and features of Hebrew poetry, Dr. Daniel plunges into the exposition that constitutes the bulk of the book. His method is a detailed study, verse by verse and word by word, on to a brief summary of the thought of each poem as a whole. Critical questions are in general avoided, or handled lightly, and with commendable reserve. It is interesting to find mild disagreement with the literal acceptance of the superscriptions of 51 and 90. However, attention is directed most of all toward meaning. One misses certain recent contributions to our understanding of the background and literal meaning of many Psalms but the emphasis upon religious meaning and enduring significance makes the book one of worth for general study of these priceless lyrics of the spirit.

The book concludes with a chapter on summarizing the religious teaching. It is organized under typical theological divisions: revelation, God, man, sin, salvation. Here again the wisdom of the author is manifest in his emphasis on great truths that we can all accept, rather than on petty, divisive theories about these realities.

WILLIAM A. IRWIN

Arabic for Beginners

By Edward J. Young. Grand Rapids: William B. Erdmans Publishing Company, 1953. 252 pp. $5.00.

Approximately one half of this book is Arabic, letters, words, and continuous passages in Professor Young's clear and orderly autograph, interspersed with printed explanations and directions. The whole is organized with care and notable skill to introduce the student lucidly to the mysteries of classical Arabic and to carry him forward by easy, logical steps toward a mastery of it. It is just what the title claims, a grammar for beginners. I know of no work to rival it in this regard. The facts can be obtained in hosts of Arabic grammars, but here they are presented in such fashion as to reduce difficulty to the lowest possible point, and to lure the student onward with genuine and deepening interest in a growing facility. In so far as it is possible to dispense with an instructor in language study this grammar offers the possibility of a student's undertaking Arabic from the very beginning and by his own efforts gradually advancing to a mastery of it. The language is of importance to the student of the Old Testament by its inimate linguistic relationship to Hebrew. Professor Young deserves gratitude, as well as warmest congratulations on his excellent work.

William A. Irwin

The Superstitions of the Irreligious

By George Hedley. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951. 140 pp. $2.50.

Here is a book that had to be written. It grew out of an address given on a college campus. It speaks to our condition. The reader will find himself resaying many of its truths. It will be read mainly, as the author knows, by preachers and teachers and serious Christians who are concerned with the superficial thinking of many an "emancipated mind" of their communities.

Dr. Hedley is Professor of Sociology and Economics in Mills College, Oakland, California. He has written other books, one of which surely ought to be in every minister's library, namely *The Symbol of the Faith,* which tells just what every one wants to know about The Apostles' Creed.

Here are listed a few of the common excuses given by people who do not go to church. The "irreligious" about whom the writer is concerned, are defined as "those who have given up religion and are proud of their surrender." As to the other term in the title, "The hallmark of superstition is unwillingness to examine the facts in a given case." "The plea I would make is that those who think to damn religion shall pause first to learn something about it."

Among the superstitions which are studied chapter by chapter are the following: that religion is necessarily at odds with fact and reason; that religion is an escape mechanism; that religious people can't have fun; that the content and emphasis of religious thought and teaching undergo no change. Dr. Hedley lists 9½ superstitions. Which of them would you call the half? It is one of those listed above.

In the last chapter Dr. Hedley summons professing Christians to learn to give a reason for their faith. Perhaps we have failed as representatives of the religion we profess. It may be that the *gospel* we have carried has not been "good news." "We must make the fellowship of our faith so real, so mighty, that the world can no longer think to ignore or discount this living body of the Christ."

J. T. Carlyon

Do You Want Inward Power?

By John Heuss. Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1953. 172 pp. $2.25.

This is a book of fourteen sermons concerning the essentials of the Christian faith. It is pointed out in the foreword that modern man has next to no knowledge of God, of who Christ is, or of what Christianity teaches about man's duty and destiny. Nor has he an adequate understanding of prayer, grace, salvation, the value of the Sacraments, or whence the Church derives its authority. These sermons are directed toward supplying answers to this lack of understanding.

It was this reviewer's privilege to become acquainted with Mr. Heuss while he was

rector of St. Matthew's Episcopal Church in Evanston, Illinois, and I bear personal testimony to the high respect in which Mr. Heuss is held by his own denomination and leaders of other groups, both educational and religious. He is now rector of New York's famous Trinity Church.

The style of writing in these sermons is refreshing because of its simplicity and directness. The sermon on "What Does God Do About Evil?" will illustrate this point:

> The doctrine of creation leaves us with the question, What does God do about evil? . . . The materialist and the Christian have only one thing in common. Both take the reality of evil seriously. I think I can make crystal-clear how they differ in their understanding of what evil is, because each one interprets evil differently and each has a different solution to it. . . . The materialist believes that there are three kinds of evil. The Christian goes him one better and insists there are four.

The first three forms of evil that both materialist and Christian agree exist are given as ignorance, human suffering, and ugliness. The fourth kind of evil is sin.

In the conclusion of the sermon Mr. Heuss states: "God does not strike first at ignorance. He does not enter his world to put a stop to human suffering. He does not wipe out the ugliness which we have spawned upon the earth. These evils He knows that redeemed man can solve. But the only men who can solve these evils are men who are first sorry for their own sin. The only men who will ever make this world a better place to live in are men who first know what it means to be forgiven by Almighty God. Only such men are so forgetful of self that they are able to absorb and lessen the evil of the world."

"This is the kind of man God wants each one of us to be."

It is in this direct manner that each of the subjects in this series is attacked.

THOMAS H. MARSH

SERMONS

G. T. Bellhouse is minister in St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Eastbourne, England. Philosophical Library, 1951, published twenty-one of his sermons under the title *Immortal Longings*, making 128 pages for $2.75. These are helpful little homilies, easy to listen to, but without much challenge. Spiritual milk, not strong meat. Home-made cookies put on a low shelf.

John Short, of Scottish birth and education, is now minister in St. George's United Church, Toronto. Scribner's Sons, 1952, published twenty of his sermons under title of *Triumphant Living*, 177 pages, $2.50. Comforting sermons and comfortable, urbane, with wide variety of literary allusion; yet not stirring nor profound.

Carlyle Marney is minister of the First Baptist Church, Austin. Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1953, published ten of his sermons under title *These Things Remain*, 174 pages, $2.00. This "be-back-in-a-flash" type of preaching would be exciting to listen to, if you didn't get tired of the style: brisk and breezy; dashes, exclamation points, question marks; everywhere Italics and a glut of epigrams; twenty-eight lines to the page, often divided into six or seven paragraphs; strings of fat adjectives to sling like sausages. Yet this is not just show. There is passion and intensity here, a good deal of historical knowledge effectively if glibly used, a genuine concern for people. Surely, Mr. Marney is the center of a live church.

Harold A. Bosley is minister in First Methodist Church in Evanston. Harper & Brothers, 1953, published nineteen of his sermons or addresses under the title *Preaching on Controversial Issues*, 221 pages, $3.00. The subjects dealt with are such as "Science and Religion," "War and Peace," "Should the United States Have an Ambassador at the Vatican?" "Is Drinking a Religious Problem?" "Christianity and Communism." Whatever anyone's own attitudes toward the "controversial issues" raised in these sermons may be, the procedure employed in presenting them is unexceptionable. The temper of mind, fairness of spirit, sensitive, thoughtful and comprehensive understanding of the problems involved are admirable indeed. There is here deepening of spirit and increase of relevant concern for anyone who will join himself with Dr. Bosley in the effort to bring the insights and the dynamic of the Christian faith to bear on the special and persistent problems of our time.

FRED D. GEALY